

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,226	03/25/2004	Julie Dyall	3219/7	6542
Elie H. Gendlo	7590 · 11/27/200 ff, Ph.D., Esq.	EXAMINER		
AMSTER, ROTHSTEIN & EBENSTEIN LLP 90 Park Avenue New York, NY 10016			HORNING, MICHELLE S	
			. ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	
e e	,	•		
i '			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/809,226	DYALL ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Michelle Horning	1648			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAISIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATE 36(a). In no event, however, may a repty b will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS f cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. e timely filed rom the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	N⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>9/11/2007</u> .					
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠ 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1,11,16-18 and 22-26 is/are pending is 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) 11,16-18 and 22-26 is/are objected to Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>3/25/2004</u> is/are: a) ⊠ accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•				
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applic rity documents have been rece u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage			
•						
Attachmen	nt(s)					
2) Notice 3) Infor	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Sumrr Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	il Date			

Application/Control Number: 10/809,226

Art Unit: 1648

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is responsive to communication filed 9/11/2007. The status of the claims is as follows: claims 1, 11, 16-18 and 22-26 are under current examination.

The following rejections have been withdrawn due to claim amendments:

- 1. 35 USC 102 (Capon et al); and
- 2. 35 USC 103 (Capon et al and Olivo et al).

## Double Patenting-NECESSITATED BY AMENDMENTS

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claim 1 of U. S. Patent No. 6750009 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

Application/Control Number: 10/809,226

Art Unit: 1648

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: while the claims differ in scope both claims are drawn to the same methods comprising the same steps. More specifically, the claims are drawn to

A method of screening a candidate antiviral agent for antiviral activity comprising

- (a) preparing a first cell culture comprising cells containing a first subgenomic viral replication system, and a second cell culture comprising cells containing a second subgenomic viral replication system; then
  - (b) adding the candidate antiviral agent to each cell culture; then
- (c) incubating the cell cultures under conditions and for a time sufficient to detect an antiviral effect by the candidate antiviral agent on the subgenomic viral replication systems; and
- (d) determining the effect of the candidate antiviral agent on each viral replication system,

wherein the first subgenomic viral replication system is genetically distinct from the second subgenomic viral replication system, and wherein the first and second cell cultures are combined before step (b), and

wherein the candidate antiviral agent (i) is an organic chemical that does not comprise an oligopeptide or an oligonucleotide or (ii) comprises an oligopeptide or an oligonucleotide

## Claim Objections

Claims 11, 16-18 and 22-26 are objected to because of the following informalities: the objected claims depend on claim 1 which stands rejected.

Appropriate correction is required.

### **Conclusions**

NO claim is allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle Horning whose telephone number is 571-272-9036. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on 571-272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michelle Horning Patent Examiner

/Bruce Campell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1648